

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Tyrone Lamar Roberson, #191327,)	C/A NO. 2:11-3114-CMC-BHH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
v.)	
)	
Kela E. Thomas, South Carolina)	
Department of Corrections Commission;)	
Anthony J. Padula, Lee Correctional)	
Institution Warden; Major James C. Dean;)	
Lieutenant A. Davis; William Byars, Jr.;)	
SCDC Director; Lieutenant E. Mims;)	
Sergeant B. Cook; Captain Sharon Patterson;)	
Captain Angela Brown; Leroy Cartledge;)	
Ms. A. Glidewell, Captain DHO of SCDC;)	
Ms. Fuller, Lee CI LPN; and)	
Sgt. A. Wideman,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, filed in this court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On February 16, 2012, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Defendants Thomas, Padula, Byars, Patterson, Brown, Cartledge, Glidewell, Fuller, Wideman be dismissed from this matter without prejudice and without service of process. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has filed

no objections and the time for doing so has expired.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order. Defendants Thomas, Padula, Byars, Patterson, Brown, Cartledge, Glidewell, Fuller, Wideman are dismissed from this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. This matter is returned to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
March 9, 2012